

BASIS FOR THE AMENDMENT

Claim 1 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error as supported by Claim 6 as originally filed and at page 8, lines 15 to 16 of the specification.

No new matter is believed to have been added by entry of this amendment. Entry and favorable reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-16 will now be active in this application.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Acquah for his helpful and courteous discussion with Applicants' Representative on March 21, 2002.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

The present invention as set forth in Claim 1 relates to a resin composition which comprises

- (a) from 70 to 95 wt% of a polyphenylene sulfide; and
- (b) from 5 to 30 wt% of a tetrafluoroethylene/perfluoro(alkylvinyl ether) copolymer or a tetrafluoroethylene/hexafluoropropylene copolymer having a solidification temperature (T_{mc}) of at least 237°C when cooled at a cooling rate of 10°C/min after melting in a nitrogen atmosphere at 330°C. The amounts of (a) and (b) are based on the total amount of (a) and (b).

In contrast, Kato et al disclose a molding composition having 37.5 to 50 wt% of polyphenylene sulfide (PPS). This reference fails to disclose or suggest a composition having 70 to 95 wt% of PPS as claimed.

Kato et al disclose a non-sticking sliding part molding composition comprising a mixture of a fluororesin and a thermoplastic resin other than a fluororesin and a fibrous filler (Kato et al, abstract, col. 2, lines 9-18). The thermoplastic resin other than the fluororesin can be polyphenylene sulfide (PPS) (Kato et al, col. 3, line 6).

The mixture of fluororesin and thermoplastic resin other than fluororesin accounts for 70 to 95 wt% of the composition. Further, the amount of thermoplastic resin other than fluororesin occurs in a proportion of 60 to 100 parts by weight based on 100 parts by weight of the fluororesin. Thus, the amount of PPS can be 60 to 100 parts by weight based on 100 parts by weight of the fluororesin.

The conversion of parts by weight to wt% is as follows:

the amount of PPS (60 parts by weight or 100 parts by weight) is divided by the total amount of PPS and fluororesin (160 parts by weight or 200 parts by weight) and multiplied by 100.

Lower limit: $60/(60+100)=60/160=0.375$

$0.375*100=37.5\%$.

Upper limit: $100/(100+100)=100/200=0.5$

$0.5*100=50\%$.

Thus, the lower limit of PPS in Kato et al based on the total amount of PPS and fluororesin is 37.5 wt% and the upper limit is 50 wt%. However, in the claimed invention, the amount of PPS is much higher: 70-95 wt% based on the total amount of PPS and fluoro-resin.

Furthermore, the Examples of Kato et al only show compositions with 35 or 40 wt% of PPS (Kato et al, col. 6, Table 1). The Comparative Examples of the reference have 30, 50 and 55 wt% of PPS all of which are lower than the presently claimed 70-95 wt%. The closest

Example of the reference, Comparative Example 3, has 55 wt% of PPS, 15 wt % of PTFE and 30 wt% of carbon filler. However, the amount of PPS is lower than the claimed amount and the fluororesin is PTFE and not a tetrafluoroethylene/perfluoro(alkylvinyl ether) copolymer or a tetrafluoroethylene/hexafluoropropylene copolymer as claimed. In addition, the reference discloses that with increasing proportion of PPS the wear of the testpiece and of the associated piece is remarkable and the testpiece is poor in toner-repellent property (Kato et al, col 7, lines 21-31). Thus, this reference teaches away from using a large proportion of PPS and shows that even 50 and 55 wt% are detrimental. Thus, there is no motivation to increase the amount of PPS even further to 70-95 wt% as claimed.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Kato et al is believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.